

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-44 are pending in the application, with 1, 10, 21, 22, 30, and 39 being the independent claims. Claims 1-44 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16-25, 27-33, 35-40, and 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,016,512 to Huitema ("Huitema"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that Huitema does not anticipate claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16-25, 27-33, 35-40, and 42-44. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 1, 10, 21, 22, 30, and 39

Amended independent claim 1 recites a "method for identifying frequently accessed domain names in a personal computer that includes a memory and a communication interface, the frequently accessed domain names to be provided to a network gateway for use in domain name system caching," including the steps of:

- (a) searching files in the memory to identify the frequently accessed domain names; and

(b) providing the frequently accessed domain names to the communication interface for transmission to the network gateway over a communication path;
wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names.

Huitema teaches a system for prefetching and storing domain name data in a "local cache server 310" that "includes a most frequently used domain names (MFU DNs) table 320 and a validity code table 330." (Huitema, col. 3, ll. 17-24; FIG. 3, generally). Huitema further teaches that the local cache server is not a personal computer, but is instead "preferably ... a high-end network server having capacity to hold a few million records in its database and high-speed network access." (Huitema, col. 3, ll. 24-27). Accordingly, Huitema does not teach the use of a personal computer for performing the steps recited in amended independent claim 1.

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the personal computer of independent claim 1 is equivalent to the local cache server of Huitema, Huitema cannot be said to teach "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 1. Huitema nowhere discloses applications resident in the local cache server having application data files from which frequently accessed domain names may be identified. Therefore, Huitema cannot be said to teach or suggest each of the features of amended independent claim 1.

Amended independent claims 10 and 21 each recite a personal computer as well as the step of "searching files in [a] memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names." For similar

reasons to those provided for independent claim 1, Huitema cannot be said to teach or suggest each of the features of independent claims 10 and 21.

Amended independent claim 22 recites a personal computer comprising "a memory that stores files, wherein the files comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names." For similar reasons to those provided for independent claim 1, Huitema cannot be said to teach or suggest each of the features of independent claim 22.

Amended independent claim 30 recites a "personal computer (PC) including a memory that stores files ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names." For similar reasons to those provided for independent claim 1, Huitema cannot be said to teach or suggest each of the features of independent claim 30.

Amended independent claim 39 recites a computer program product for a personal computer including "means for enabling [a] processor to search files in [a] memory to identify ... frequently accessed domain names." Claim 39 further recites that the files in the memory "comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names." For similar reasons to those provided for independent claim 1, Huitema cannot be said to teach or suggest each of the features of independent claim 39.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 10, 21, 22, 30, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, 7-9, 13, 14, 16-20, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-38, 40, and 42-44

Applicant submits that dependent claims 4, 5, 7-9, 13, 14, 16-20, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-38, 40, and 42-44 are not anticipated by Huitema for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1, 10, 21, 22, 30, and 39 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 4, 5, 7-9, 13, 14, 16-20, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-38, 40, and 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Huitema in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0126812 A1 to Majewski et al. ("Majewski"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 based on the combination of Huitema and Majewski.

As discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 1. Majewski does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Majewski does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 1. As a consequence,

dependent claims 2 and 3 are also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Majewski for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Similarly, as discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 10. Majewski does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Majewski does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 10. As a consequence, dependent claims 11 and 12 are also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Majewski for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Huitema in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0120783 A1 to Evgey ("Evgey"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41 based on the combination of Huitema and Evgey.

As discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold

frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 1. Evgey does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Evgey does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 1. As a consequence, dependent claim 6 is also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Evgey for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

As discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 10. Evgey does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Evgey does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 10. As a consequence, dependent claim 15 is also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Evgey for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

As discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 22. Evgey does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Evgey does not teach or suggest each and

every feature of amended independent claim 22. As a consequence, dependent claim 26 is also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Evgey for at least the same reasons as independent claim 22 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

As discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 30. Evgey does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Evgey does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 30. As a consequence, dependent claim 34 is also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Evgey for at least the same reasons as independent claim 30 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

As discussed above, Huitema does not teach or suggest "searching files in the memory ... wherein the files in the memory comprise application data files that hold frequently accessed domain names," as recited in amended independent claim 39. Evgey does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the combination of Huitema and Evgey does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 39. As a consequence, dependent claim 41 is also not rendered obvious by Huitema and Evgey for at least the same reasons as independent claim 39 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective

features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.


Thomas C. Fiala
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,610

Date: 8/17/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
535717v1